

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/589,087	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MOLTENI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> PATRICIA MORRIS	<b>Art Unit</b> 1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6,7,9 and 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/19/08:10/16/08:5/12/11</u>.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> |
|---|--|

Art Unit: 1625

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-5 and 11 are under consideration in this application.

Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 are held withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to nonelected subject matter 37 CFR 1.142(b).

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I and example 22 in the reply filed on May 12, 2011 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground that all the groups have a special technical feature. This is not found persuasive for the reasons clearly set forth in the previous Office action. Moreover, applicants have failed to advance any cogent reasons as to why the inventions do not lack unity of invention. It is evidenced that it is well recognized in the art that liver X receptors are class of receptors involved in many regulatory mechanisms with other enzymes and physiological systems. Claims 6 and 9 are drawn to the treatment and prevention of any and all unknown disorders due to an alleged inhibition of a liver X receptor whereas claim 7 recites a laundry list of diseases. There is no evidence of record that the instant compounds are able to treat and prevent all disorders associated with a liver X receptor. A claim to all liver X receptor mediated disorders is considered a reach through to the continuous development of the field and do not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

It is too burdensome for the examiner to search all of the previously noted searches in their respective, completely divergent, areas for the non-elected subject matter, as well, in the limited time provided to search one invention.

The restriction requirement is deemed sound and proper and will be maintained.

Art Unit: 1625

The application has been examined to the extent readable on the elected compounds wherein one of Y is C, R<sub>2</sub>, R<sub>3</sub> are aryl or cycloalkyl, R<sub>4</sub>-R<sub>10</sub> represent non-heterocyclic groups and n, R<sub>1</sub> and Z as set forth in claim 1, exclusively.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is a lack of description as to how the hydrates and solvates are produced and what solvates and hydrates are produced in the specification. Vippagunta et al. (Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews 48 (2001) 3-26) recites on page 18 that predicting the formation of solvates of a compound and the number of molecules of solvent or water incorporated into the crystal lattice of a compound is complex and difficult. Guillory (in Brittain et al., NY:Marcel Dekker, 1999, pages 183-226, teach that solvates and hydrates are formed by recrystallization of drug substances. Note page 203 therein. However, not all compounds will form solvates or hydrates. Note section 3.4 of Vippagunta et al.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for preparing the instant compound and its salts, does not reasonably provide enablement for preparing any and all unknown solvates or derivatives. The specification does

Art Unit: 1625

not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The specification fails to prepare any solvates and hydrates or identify the solvates and hydrates obtained.

One should be able, from a reading of the claims, determine what that claim does or does not encompass.

Why? Because that claim precludes others from making, using, or selling that compound for 20 years. Therefore, one must know what compound is being claimed.

The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. Applicants are referred to In re Fouche, 169 USPQ 429 CCPA 1971, MPEP 716.02(b).

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue. These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

### ***The nature of the invention***

The nature of the invention is the preparation of a compound, its salts, hydrates, isomers and solvates.

Art Unit: 1625

***State of the Prior Art***

Predicting the formation of solvates or hydrates of a compound and the number of molecules of solvent or water incorporated into the crystal lattice of a compound is complex and difficult. Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates and hence generalizations cannot be made for a series of compounds. Note section 3.4 of Vippaguanta et al.

***The amount of direction or guidance and the presence or absence of working examples***

The working examples in the specification fail to show how any solvates and derivatives are produced. Further, Guillory on page 199 recites that compounds originally crystallized as solvates can lose the solvent induced by heat or vacuum vaporization.

***The breadth of the claims***

The breadth of the claims is drawn to the preparation of the compound, its salts, isomers and all hydrates and solvate forms.

***The quantity of experimentation needed***

The quantity of experimentation needed would be undue when faced with the lack of direction and guidance present in the instant specification in regards to the process of preparing all unknown solvates.

In terms of the 8 Wands factors, undue experimentation would be required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of unpredictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by applicants. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

Art Unit: 1625

Genentech Inc v. Novo Nordisk A/S (CAFC) 42 USPQ2d 1001, states that “a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion” and [p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable”.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The terms solvates and hydrates in claim 1 are indefinite to their meaning.

The plural ‘s’ on “hydrates, salts, isomers and solvates” makes claim 1 read on mixtures rather than specific compounds.

In view of applicants’ amendments to the claim 1 canceling the non-elected compounds, claim 11 lacks antecedent basis for the thiadiazole and pyridyl compounds recited on pages 13 and 18 of the instant response.

The claims measure the invention. United Carbon Co. V. Binney & Smith Co., 55 USPQ 381 at 384, col. 1, end of 1st paragraph, Supreme Court of the United States (1942).

The C.C.P.A. in 1978 held “that invention is the subject matter defined by the claims submitted by the applicant. We have consistently held that no applicant should have limitations of the specification read into a claim where no express statement of the limitation is included in the claim”: In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, at 15.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 set forth in this Office action.

Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and if rewritten directed solely to the elected compounds.

Claims 2-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

Art Unit: 1625

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Patricia L. Morris/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

plm  
June 27, 2011